

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed September 9, 2004 has been received and the Examiner's comments carefully reviewed. Prior to entry of this paper, Claims 1-20 were pending. Claims 1, 12, and 16 were rejected. Claim 2-11, 13-15, and 17-20 were objected to, but were identified as being allowable if re-written in independent form. In this paper, Claims 1, 2, 12, 13, and 17 are amended. Claims 1 and 12 are amended to correct informalities, and not for any reason related to patentability. Claims 2, 13, and 17 are re-written in independent form. Claims 1-20 are currently pending. No new subject matter has been added. For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the presently pending claims is in condition for allowance.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-11, 13-15, and 17-20 were identified as being allowable if re-written in independent form.

In this paper, Claims 2, 13, and 17 have been re-written in independent form. For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2, 13, and 17 are in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 12, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Medlock et al (US 6,567,017). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is submitted to be allowable at least because Medlock does not disclose “a code logic circuit that is arranged to: receive a code number signal and the spreading factor signal, and **provide a right-justified code signal** in response to the code number signal and the spreading factor signal, wherein the right-justified code signal **corresponds to a right justified version of the code number signal**” (emphasis added), as recited in Applicant’s Claim 1.

In contrast, Medlock describes a code generator system for spread spectrum applications. The code generator system includes a code generation unit that is configurable to provide a variety of codes including multiple types of channelization codes, multiple types of traffic codes, multiple types of user codes, and/or multiple types of extended codes (see column 7, lines 1-10 of Medlock). Medlock does not make any reference to right-justifying a code number signal.

Claims 3-11 are respectfully submitted to be allowable at least because they depend from Claim 1, which is submitted to be allowable.

Claim 12 is submitted to be allowable at least because Medlock does not disclose "right justifying the code number based on the spreading factor", as recited in Applicant's Claim 12.

Claims 14-15 are respectfully submitted to be allowable at least because they depend from Claim 12, which is submitted to be allowable.

Also, Claim 16 is submitted to be allowable at least because Medlock does not disclose "a means for right justifying, wherein the means for right justifying is configured to right justify the code number in response to the spreading factor to provide a right-justified code number", as recited in Applicant's Claim 16.

Claims 18-20 are respectfully submitted to be allowable at least because they depend from Claim 16, which is submitted to be allowable.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that each of the presently pending claims (Claims 1-20) are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is requested. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's representative at the below-listed telephone number if it is believed that prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby. Although certain arguments regarding patentability are set forth herein, there may be other arguments and reasons why the claimed invention is patentably distinct. Applicant reserves the right to raise these arguments in the future.

Dated: December 3, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Matthew M. Gaffney

Registration No.: 46,717

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(206) 262-8900

(212) 753-6237 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

Customer No.: 38845